

### REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, and 22 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, and 22 have been amended, and new claim 23 has been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, and 22-23 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and drawings. Particularly, amendments to independent claims 1, 12, and 13 are supported in the specification at least in Line 19 on Page 27 to Line 1 on Page 28, amendments to independent claims 11 and 16 are supported by at least Line 16 on Page 26 to Line 2 on Page 27 of the specification, and amendments to independent claim 22 are supported at least in Lines 16-18 on Page 27 and in lines 18-20 on Page 28 of the specification. Dependent claims 2-8 are amended corresponding to the amendments to independent claim 1. Support for new claim 23 can be found at least from Line 19 on Page 27 to Line 1 on Page 28 of the specification, and in Fig. 21.

### Examiner's Response to Arguments

In item 9 on page 8 of the Office Action the Examiner provided a response to the arguments presented in the Applicants' previous Amendment. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not properly overcome at least some of these arguments. The Examiner's responses are addressed below.

The Applicants supplied the following argument in the previous Amendment:

Further, amended claim 1 recites presenting keywords to a first user through a network, and storing keywords selected from the presented keywords by the first user into a user-by-keyword management table relating to the first user. Even if the user submitted information is considered, *arguendo*, to be keywords, it is respectfully submitted that these features are not disclosed in any of the cited references.

In Ng, the user submitted information is all submitted by the users, and not selected from any presented keywords. The user in Ng submits "new information about a product Q, including the make, model, and price, and the URL of the supplying store's product web page" (Column 7, Lines 63-65). Thus, as all of this information is generated by the user, it is apparent that none of it is selected from any presented keywords, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, the Examiner alleged that this feature is disclosed in Ng, because a reviewer may be presented with the product/service review in order to correct the review, and the selected review may

be updated and attributed to the updating user. However, as already discussed in this Amendment, it would be readily apparent to one skilled in the art that the product/service reviews of Ng are not tantamount to search keywords.

In more detail, Ng discloses that a searchable database contains information submitted by rewarded users, that a plurality of records each contain information presented to a searcher when search terms input by the searcher match terms in the record, that a reward database contains account records for users including a reward count for each other, that the reward module increases a reward count for the rewarded user when the searcher views the information in the target record submitted by the rewarded user, and that rewards for submitting information depend on a number of times the information is viewed by others (Column 3, Lines 22-40).

Assuming, arguendo, that "the rewarded user" is "the first user", "the search term" is "the keyword", and "the searcher" is "the second user", no "advertiser" is included in Ng, and thus, Ng discloses a system in which the first user is rewarded when the second user views the information submitted by the first user, not an advertisement by the advertiser.

In response, the Examiner simply stated that Ng discloses the feature of a listing of product categories being presented to the reviewer, and that the categories reads on the Applicants' keyword presentation.

However, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response by the Examiner does not refute the arguments made by the Applicants, and actually seems to support them. It is shown in great detail above that nothing approaching keywords is "presented" to the first user to be registered. The Examiner has answered that the category listings are presented to the first user. However, the category listings would inherently then not be selected and registered for the first user, who is simply submitting information under those listings. The category listings could not be registered to the user, or any product looked at under that category listing, and not reported on by the user, would then result in a reward of some type. The Applicants respectfully submit that this is not a reasonable interpretation of Ng.

The Applicants also presented the following arguments in the previous Amendment:

Assuming, arguendo, that "the rewarded user" is "the first user", "the search term" is "the keyword", and "the searcher" is "the second user", no "advertiser" is included in Ng, and thus, Ng discloses a system in which the first user is rewarded when the second user views the information submitted by the first user, not an advertisement by the advertiser.

As seen in the Summary of the Invention, Ng fails to disclose features of posting result of the search along with an advertisement of corresponding advertiser to the second user, and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement.

Even further, the Examiner asserts that, with respect to claim 1, Ng discloses the feature of presenting keywords to a first user at Column 5, Line 21 through Column 6, Line 51, the feature of searching the user-by-keyword

management table and advertiser-by-keyword management table, and when the requested keywords have been registered both in the user-by-keyword management table and the advertiser-by-keyword management table, posting a retrieved result of the keywords and advertisement to the second user, and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement at Column 8, Lines 33-49.

However, what Ng discloses at Column 5, Line 21 through Column 6, Line 51, and the related text, is that when a user corrects an error in a database, the user is rewarded. Ng discloses that when a user enters new product information or corrects existing information in product database 30, the account manager 42 rewards the user by increasing a reward count in reward database 44, and when other users access data in the database 30, or use that information to link to a supplier, the account manager 42 increases the reward count for the user that supplied or corrected the information used by other users (Column 5, Lines 58-65).

Also, Ng discloses, at Column 8, Lines 33-49 that when user B searches for a product and finds product Q that was entered into the database by user A, user A receives one additional point for the database "hit" on product Q.

Therefore, Ng does not have the user-by-keyword database and advertiser-by-keyword database, and, accordingly, Ng fails to disclose searching the user-by-keyword management table and advertiser-by-keyword management table when a search using the keywords is requested by a second user different from the first user, and, when the keywords have been registered both in the user-by-keyword management table and the advertiser-by-keyword management table, posting a result of the search along with advertisement to the second user.

Additionally, in Ng, a point is given to the first user not when the first user refers to the advertisement, but rather when a different user accesses information which the first user submitted or the different user used the information.

Therefore, Ng also fails to disclose the feature of giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement.

In these arguments, the Applicants presented many details regarding how the information seen by the second user is simply the information submitted by the first user, and no advertisement is provided along with that information, much less an advertisement from an advertiser-by-keyword management table. The Examiner simply responded that Ng "teaches the features of being rewarding [sic] for viewing advertisements thus implying advertisers", citing Column 14, Lines 52-63. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ng discloses no such feature, especially in the section cited by the Examiner. Rather, the section simply says that the rewards for the users can be paid as advertising revenue. This in no way implies any sort of advertisement being shown, and the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not properly rebutted the Applicants' arguments.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not overcome the previously submitted arguments, and that any action immediately subsequent to the current action should not be made final as a result.

Also, although the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not successfully rebutted these arguments, the claims of the present application have nevertheless been amended to clearly recite the features therein, and are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In item 4 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,175, issued to Ng (hereinafter referred to as "Ng"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of this claim.

Independent claims 22 is amended herein to recite the feature that a method, which provides points based on a search using keywords in a web site, comprises: in response to a request for the search by a first user, providing the first user with results of the search along with an advertisement of an advertiser associated with a keyword having been selected by the advertiser and used for the search; and in response to the providing the user with the results, giving at least one point to a second user who is different from the first user and has registered any of the keywords used for the search to the web site.

Ng fails to teach or disclose above feature, particularly, the feature of, providing the first user with results of the search along with an advertisement of an advertiser associated with a keyword having been selected by the advertiser and used for the search; and in response to the providing the first user with the results, giving at least one point to a second user who is different from the first user.

Accordingly, Ng does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claim 22. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Ng does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 22, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 patentably distinguishes over Ng, and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 6 on pages 3-6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,725, issued to Davis et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Davis"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite a feature that a method of providing points based on a search using keywords comprises: presenting a first set of keywords to a first user through a network; accepting, from the first user, a selection of at least one of the first set of keywords presented to the first user; storing, in a first table, the at least one keyword selected from the presented keywords as is related to the first user; presenting a second set of keywords to an advertiser through the network; accepting, from the advertiser, a selection of at least one of the second set of keywords presented to the advertiser; storing, in a second table, the at least one keyword selected by the advertiser as is related to the advertiser; in response to a reception of a request for the search from a second user different from the first user through the network, searching the first table and the second table for keywords specified in the request for the search, and when any of the specified keywords is found both in the first table and the second table, sending results of the search along with an advertisement associated with at least one keyword in the second table to the second user through the network; and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement by storing the given points as related to the first user in a third table which keeps point information for each user.

Ng fails to teach or disclose above feature, particularly, the feature of, presenting a first set of keywords to a first user through a network; accepting, from the first user, a selection of at least one of the first set of keywords presented to the first user; storing, in a first table, the at least one keyword selected from the presented keywords as is related to the first user; presenting a second set of keywords to an advertiser through the network; accepting, from the advertiser, a selection of at least one of the second set of keywords presented to the advertiser; storing, in a second table, the at least one keyword selected by the advertiser as is related to the advertiser; and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement by storing the given points as related to the first user in a third table which keeps point information for each user.

Davis et al. (hereinafter, Davis) also fails to teach or disclose the feature which Ng fails to teach or disclose. Therefore, Ng, Davis, and combination thereof fail to teach or disclose the feature of claim 1. And thus, claim 1 is not obvious from Ng, Davis, or any combination thereof.

Claims 2, 3, and 8 depend from claim 1. Independent claims 12 and 13 are amended to have similar features to claim 1. Thus, also, these claims are not obvious from the cited prior arts and combination thereof.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

In item 7 on page 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng and Davis as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0051911, issued to Marks et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Marks"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

As previously discussed in this Amendment, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Ng and Davis. Further, Marks does not cure the discussed deficiencies of Ng and Davis. Therefore, as claims 4-7 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-7 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 8 on pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Ng. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Independent claim 11 is amended to recite a feature that a method of providing points based on a search using keywords comprises: in response to a reception of a request for the search from a first user, displaying results of the search together with an advertisement of an advertiser associated with a keyword having been selected by the advertiser and used for the search at a first user's terminal; and when the first user follows a link set to the advertisement to visit an advertiser's site of the advertisement, giving points to a second user who is different from the first user and has selected any of the keywords associated with the advertisement.

Ng fails to teach or disclose above feature, particularly, the feature of, in response to a reception of a request for the search from a first user, displaying results of the search together with an advertisement of an advertiser associated with a keyword having been selected by the advertiser and used for the search at a first user's terminal. Davis also fails to teach or disclose the feature which Ng fails to teach or disclose. Therefore, Ng, Davis, and combination thereof fail to teach or disclose the feature of claim 11. Further, Marks also fails to teach or disclose above feature which Ng, Davis, and combination thereof fail to teach or disclose. And thus, claim 11 is not obvious from Ng, Davis, Marks, or any combination thereof.

Independent claim 16 is amended to have similar features to claim 11. Thus, also, claim 16 is not obvious from the cited prior arts and any combination thereof.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, and 22 have been amended, and new claim 23 has been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-8, 11-13, and 22-23 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 15, 2008

By: Thomas L. Jones

Thomas L. Jones  
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501